DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 496 EC 306 237

AUTHOR	Kelly, Luke E.
TITLE	Adapted Physical Education National Standards (APENS) Job Analysis Survey. Results of a National Survey of the Roles Performed and Preparation Received by Professionals Serving as Adapted Physical Educators.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	66p.; A Project of the National Consortium for Physical Education and Recreation for Individuals with Disabilities.
CONTRACT	H029K20092
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adapted Physical Education; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Licensing Examinations (Professions); National Surveys; Needs Assessment; *Physical Education Teachers; Standards; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings of a national survey to determine the job functions and training of teachers of adapted physical education. The survey was part of a larger project whose goal was to establish standards and a national certification examination for adapted physical educators. The survey involved questions concerning teacher education and experience, job demographics, roles and responsibilities, and perceptions of training received and desired. Surveys were sent to 575 adapted physical education teachers, which resulted in 293 usable surveys. Analysis of findings indicated that teachers spent an average of 51 percent of their time providing direct services to students and 26 percent providing indirect services. Most teachers served students of all ages and were involved in decisions regarding eligibility for services, placement, Individualized Education Program development, assessment, and instructional content. Teachers reported that their training had involved approximately equal emphases in scientific foundations, behavioral/educational foundations, and planning and implementation. The major sub-content areas in which respondents desired more training were teaching, motor development, continuing education, and human development. The survey is appended. (Contains 10 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EC

ED 417 496

Adapted Physical Education National Standards (APENS)[1]

Job Analysis Survey

Results of a National Survey of the Roles Performed and Preparation Received by Professionals Serving as Adapted Physical Educators

A Project of the National Consortium for Physical Education and Recreation for Individuals with Disabilities in Accordance with its Mission to Serve the Profession

Luke E. Kelly, Ph.D.
Project Director and Author

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

[1] A Special Project funded by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Division of Personnel Preparation: #H029K20092.

EC 306 237

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Federal Disclaimer

This report was developed as part of the National Standards for Adapted Physical Education Project which was funded by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Division of Personnel Preparation: #H029K20092. The views expressed herein are those of the grantee, the NCPERID. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education is intended or should be inferred.

EC 306237

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgments

The Project Director would like to thank all of the teachers in the field who took time from their busy schedules to complete this comprehensive survey of their current job responsibilities. This information was essential and provided the foundation for the development of the adapted physical education national standards. The Project Director would also like to thank the members of the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee for their review and evaluations of the draft instruments and the Project Staff for their countless hours of work on this survey. Clearly without a valid well constructed instrument we would not have been able to accurately collect the information needed to create the national standards.

Executive Committee

Member	Representing
Martha Bokee	U.S. Dept. Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services
Smokey Davis	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
Patrick DiRocco	University of Wisconsin - LaCrosse
Hester Henderson	University of Utah
Jeff McCubbin	Oregon State University

Steering Committee

Member	Representing
John Dunn	University of Utah
Willie Gayle	Wright State University
Barry Lavay	California State University - Long Beach
Monica Lepore	West Chester University
Mike Loovis	Cleveland State University
Janet Seaman	AAHPERD/American Association for Active Lifestyles and Fitness

Project Staff

Member	Representing
Bruce Gansneder	Bureau for Educ. Research, University of Virginia
Jim Martindale	Doctoral Student, University of Virginia
Katie Stanton	Doctoral Student, University of Virginia
David Striegel	Doctoral Student, University of Virginia
Tim Davis	Doctoral Student, University of Virginia

Table of Contents

Purpose
- APENS Committee Structure..... 2
- Survey Design 3
- Sample 4
- Return Rate 7
- Data Analysis Plan 7
- Report Organization 9

Section 1: Education
- Education 10
- Position Titles 12
- Teaching Experience 12
- State Endorsements 13
- Section Summary 15

Section 2: Job Demographics
- Teaching Settings 16
- Number of Schools Served 16
- Distribution of Work Time 18
- School Levels Served 20
- Numbers of Students Served 21
- Range of Motor Delays Served 22
- Age Levels Served 24
- Section Summary 26

Section 3: Roles
- Physical Education Placements Available..... 28
- Placements Used for Physical Education 29
- Involvement in Key Decision Making Processes 30
- Sources of Information Used to Make Decisions ... 34
- Criteria Used for Instructional Decisions 35
- Staff Development Issues Addressed 36
- Other Responsibilities 37
- When Assessments Were Performed 38
- Involvement in Transition Planning 40
- Description of How APE is Conducted 42

Section 4: Training Perceptions
- Emphasis Received in Formal Training 45
- Training Emphasis Desired 46
- Emphasis Desired by Sub-content Areas 46

References 49

Appendix A: APENS Information 50

Appendix B: Copy of the APENS Job Analysis Survey 51

Purpose

In the Fall of 1992, the National Consortium for Physical Education and Recreation for Individuals with Disabilities (NCPERID) received a five year grant to develop national standards and a national certification examination for Adapted Physical Educators from the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (Kelly, 1992). For the purposes of this report, adapted physical educators are considered teachers who are qualified to design and implement specially designed physical education programs to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities that have qualified for special education services and whose needs can not be appropriately addressed in the regular education setting without some form of support. This project was predicated on the fact that PL 94-142/101-476 defaulted to state certification requirements to define who was qualified to provide adapted physical education services. Legislators decision to use state certifications for this purpose was based on the assumption that states already had these certifications in place. Unfortunately, 17 years after the passage of PL 94-142 only 14 states had defined some form of certification or endorsement for teachers of adapted physical education. While some of these certifications/endorsements have been comprehensive, many have required that teachers have only the minimum of one or two courses in order to be qualified.

Failure to define who was qualified to provide adapted physical education services has created a number of serious problems for the profession. For example, in many states, teachers either untrained in the motor domain (e.g., aides, classroom teachers) or untrained in working with individuals with disabilities (e.g., regular physical educators) have been required to address the physical education needs of students with disabilities. In other states, related services such as OT and PT have been erroneously used as substitutes for adapted physical education. The end result of practices like these has been that students have not been receiving the services they were mandated to receive by the law, and parents and other educators have been given an inaccurate view of what adapted physical education is, and of the benefits that can be derived from this educational area.

Given the fact that most states had not defined who is qualified to provide adapted physical education services and the ramifications of using untrained professionals to deliver

physical education services on the profession, the first goal of the APENS project was to develop national standards for the profession. Standards, for the purposes of this project, represent the scope and sequence of content adapted physical educators should know to address the physical education needs of individuals with disabilities ages 3-21. Since the goal was to root these standards in what teachers needed to know to do their jobs, the first step was to conduct a national survey to determine what teachers of adapted physical education were being asked to do. A second objective of the survey was to ascertain teachers' perceptions of their preparation to meet the roles and responsibilities of their jobs. This report summarizes the procedures used to develop and administer this national job analysis survey for adapted physical education practitioners as well as the results of this survey. For additional information on the APENS project consult Kelly (1997a, 1997b, 1995, 1993, 1992, 1991a, 1991b) or Appendix A for more information.

APENS Committee Structure

While there were four major committee structures that composed the work force for this project, only the Executive and Steering Committees were in place and involved with the development and implementation of the APENS Job Analysis Survey. The composition of these committees as well as the project staff are briefly described below in terms of their membership and responsibilities.

Executive Committee (6 Members) - Project Director and Past President of NCPERID - Luke Kelly (Chair); the President of NCPERID in 1992 - Jeff McCubbin; two members from the NCPERID Board of Directors, appointed by the NCPERID Board - Patrick DiRocco, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse (official liaison between the project and the American Alliance for Health. Physical Education, Recreation and Dance [AAHPERD]), and Hester Henderson, University of Utah (official liaison between the project and the Council for Exceptional Children [CEC]); one member representing National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDE) - Smokey Davis; and one member representing USDE/OSERS/DPP - Martha Bokee. This committee was responsible for insuring that the project was implemented as intended, for making all policy decisions, and for approving all materials and products produced by the various committees.

Steering Committee (7 Members) - The Chair was the Project Director Luke E. Kelly. Members: John M. Dunn, University of Utah; G. William Gayle, Wright State University; Barry Lavay, California State University-Long Beach; Monica Lepore, West Chester University; Michael Loovis, Cleveland State University;

and Janet A. Seaman, AAHPERD/AAALF. The members of this committee applied for these positions and were reviewed and selected by the Executive Committee. The responsibilities of the Steering Committee were to: develop credentialing procedures and criteria for selecting the members of the Standards Committees and Evaluation/Review Committee; develop, implement and monitor the development of the standards and the exam; chair one of the Standards Committees; and report progress on a regular schedule to the Executive Committee.

Project Staff - The Project Staff was composed of the Project Director, a Research Consultant, a Project Assistant and a Clerical Assistant. The Project Director was Luke E. Kelly, Past President of NCPERID and Director of the graduate adapted physical education programs at the University of Virginia. The Research Consultant was Dr. Bruce Gansneder from the Bureau of Educational Research, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. The Project Assistant responsibilities were distributed across a number of doctoral students at the University of Virginia. The Clerical Assistant responsibilities were distributed across a number of Master's students.

Survey Design

The purposes of the job analysis survey were to ascertain the current roles and responsibilities of adapted physical educators, the extent of their training in adapted physical education as well as their perceptions regarding the emphasis of their training. To this end, a comprehensive review of the literature was performed to identify previous surveys (list references). These surveys were in turn analyzed and the questions divided into four categories, as illustrated below, to address the objectives of the current project. From these categories of past questions, new questions were then written by the Project Staff using (Dillman, 1978) as a guide for survey development.

1. Education and Experience (e.g., undergraduate and graduate degrees, majors and minors, years teaching experience, state certifications/endorsements, etc.).

2. Job demographics (e.g., number schools serviced, number of students served, number of hours worked, time spent on travel, percentage of students served directly/indirectly, etc.).

3. Roles and responsibilities (e.g., involvement in eligibility, placement, IEP and instructional decisions; criteria used to make decisions, assessment

tools used, staff development topics addressed, etc.).

4. Perceptions of training received and desired (e.g., motor development, attributes of learners, curriculum, instructional planning, ethics).

Draft forms of the survey were sent to the APENS Steering and Executive Committees for review and input. After revisions were made based upon these initial reviews, several small pilot tests were performed using small groups of 5-10 teachers in the field. Final revisions were made based upon the input from these groups. The final instrument (see Appendix B) was 10 pages in length, composed of 31 questions and allowed for a total of 249 responses. Table 1 illustrates the emphasis given to the four categories both in terms of the number of questions included in the final survey and in terms of the total number of responses possible. The final instrument was reviewed and approved by the APENS Executive Committee prior to being sent to a national sample.

Table 1.
Distribution of the number of questions and number of responses possible by job analysis categories in the final version of the survey.

Category	# Ques.	%Total Ques.	# Responses Possible	% Total Responses
Education	5	16%	20	8%
Demographics	10	32%	51	20%
Roles	14	45%	149	60%
Perceptions	2	7%	29	12%
Totals	31	100%	249	100%

Sample

One of the unique problems caused by not having state or national standards that describe the qualifications of adapted physical educators is that it was difficult to identify a national sample of practicing adapted physical educators. The initial plan was to use the mailing list of the 1600 members of Adapted Physical Activity Council of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD). A survey performed by Kelly (1991) revealed that this mailing list

was not coded by level (i.e., K-12 vs higher education) and contained many individuals that were not directly involved in providing adapted physical education services to individuals with disabilities. It was viewed as imperative by the APENS Steering and Executive Committees that the job analysis survey be completed by individuals that were directly involved in providing physical education services to individuals with disabilities. After exhausting all possible sources for existing mailing lists of adapted physical educators, it was ultimately decided that the Project would need to create its own list.

A sampling plan was developed based on recruiting a sample of practicing adapted physical educators from each state. The size of the sample from each state was determined by the total population of the state with the larger states contributing proportionally more subjects to the final pool. The population ranges used to delineate the number of subjects to be solicited from each state are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Target Samples based upon State Population Ranges

State Population Ranges	Target Sample
0 - < 2 million	5
> 2 million - < 5 million	10
> 5 million - < 7 million	15
> 7 million - <10 million	20
>10 million - <13 million	25
>13 million - <17 million	30
>18 million	40

Table 3 shows the number of subjects recruited from each state. To identify the actual subjects to be surveyed in each state, the APENS Steering Committee identified one or more leaders in the field in each state. The majority of the leaders were faculty at institutions of higher education and were identified from the NCPERID membership list. Each leader was contacted, informed of the purpose of the APENS job analysis, and then asked to nominate a given number of practicing adapted physical educators and to provide their names and mailing addresses. This process was projected to produce a total sample of 585 subjects. Five states could not produce the targeted number of subjects requested resulting in a final target sample of 575 subjects. In several cases, some individuals submitted more names than were requested for their respective states. In these instances, the required number of names for those states were randomly selected from the total lists provided.

Table 3.
Sample composition by state and population density.

State	Contacts	Sampled	Returned	State	Contacts	Sampled	Returned
Alabama	2	10	6	Montana	1	5	2
Alaska	1	5		Nebraska	1	5	3
Arizona	2	10	3	Nevada	1	5	2
Arkansas	2	10		New Hampshire	1	5	3
California	8	40	17	New Jersey	4	20	12
Colorado	2	10	7	New Mexico	1	5	1
Connecticut	2	10	6	New York	6	30	9
Delaware	1	5		North Carolina	3	15	2
Florida	5	25	17	North Dakota	1	5	3
Georgia	3	15	14	Ohio	5	25	15
Hawaii	1	5		Oklahoma	2	10	4
Idaho	1	5	2	Oregon	2	10	4
Illinois	5	25	24	Pennsylvania	5	25	12
Indiana	3	15	10	Rhode Island	1	5	4
Iowa	2	10	9	South Carolina	2	10	
Kansas	2	10	6	South Dakota	1	5	4
Kentucky	2	10	6	Tennessee	2	10	6
Louisiana	2	10	8	Texas	6	20	5
Maine	1	5	4	Utah	1	5	4
Maryland	2	10	9	Vermont	1	5	4
Massachusetts	3	15	13	Virginia	3	15	17
Michigan	4	20	17	Washington	2	10	3
Minnesota	2	10	6	West Virginia	1	5	
Mississippi	2	10	2	Wisconsin	2	10	4
Missouri	3	15	4	Wyoming	1	5	4

The development and administration of the job analysis survey was designated to be completed during the first year of the APENS Project. The Fall of the first year of the project was devoted to defining the committee structures and appointing individuals to these committees. Once the committees were established, the creation of the survey instrument was the next priority. Since it was imperative to administer the surveys to the teachers before they recessed for the summer, the survey was administered in stages as the subjects were identified in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

various states. The first block of surveys was sent to 355 of the subjects on April 16th. As additional subjects were identified, they were grouped in blocks and the additional blocks of surveys were mailed each Friday until the total of 575 surveys had been mailed by May 26th. Follow-up post cards were sent to subjects in each block 5 days after each block mailing and a follow-up letter was sent to each subject 9 days after each block mailing. Finally, a second survey was sent to all subjects that had not responded by June 11th.

Return Rate

A total of 354 subjects returned their surveys for total return rate of 62% (354/575). Of this total, 61 did not complete 25% or more of the questions and as result were dropped reducing the total complete surveys to 293 or a usable return rate of 51%. All of the surveys were coded and the data entered to an SPSS file. The SPSS data were printed and verified against the raw data on the surveys to confirm that the data were entered accurately. While a higher return rate would have been desired, the return rate of 51% compares favorably with other published survey studies in the field. For example, Bird and Gansneder (1979) reported a return rate of 40%, while Melograno and Loovis (1991) reported a return rate of 30%.

Data Analysis Plan

Lacking any previous national data on adapted physical educators, it was unknown how homogenous or heterogenous this sample would be. It was hypothesized that within the sample there may be significant differences between groups of subjects on factors or combination of factors such as:

- Whether they provided direct of indirect APE services?
- Whether they teach APE full or part-time?
- Differences in their formal educations?
    - undergraduate degree majors?
    - graduate degree majors?
    - undergraduate versus graduate degrees?
- Amount of teaching experience?
- Whether they are in a state with an APE endorsement or not?
- Whether they have an APE endorsement?
- Whether they work in an urban or rural setting?

To test these hypotheses, the data were systematically grouped by the above independent variables and all possible combinations and the responses on the remaining survey questions examined for significant differences. It was anticipated that random differences would be found between various subgroups on a few

variables purely due to chance and the large number of comparisons that were being made. The data from these preliminary analyses were examined for overall trends rather then for specific differences on one or two items. Overall, the sample was found to be more homogeneous than heterogeneous. Only one small subgroup of subjects was found to differ from the rest of the sample on a number of questions. This subgroup was defined as the Formally Trained and Experienced (FTE) group of APE teachers. To be included in this group, subjects had to have reported: possessing a bachelor's degree in physical education, a master's degree in Adapted Physical Education, four or more years of teaching experience in APE and currently hold a position where they provide APE services for more than 75% of their time. It is important to note that this was a very small subgroup composed of only 28 (9.6%) of the total 293 subjects.

Given the homogeneity of the sample, results are presented for the total sample and then for the two subgroups. For questions where their were significant differences between the small FTE group and the remaining sample (Other group), these are highlighted in bold text. It should be emphasized that while there were a number of significant differences between the small FTE group (n=28) and the Other group (n=265), overall these groups were more like each other than different from each other.

Many of the questions in the survey asked the respondents to report other examples or to provide explanations. All of the free responses were recorded and coded. For the purposes of this report, all of the free responses for a given item that received a frequency of greater than 5% were reported. A number of questions on the survey also asked the respondents to differentiate between whether they provided direct or indirect adapted physical education services. Direct and indirect services were explicitly defined in both the cover letter and in the survey instructions. The definitions used on the survey were:

> **Direct Adapted Physical Education Services**: Adapted physical education taught solely by you as the adapted specialist in the school. You are the students' primary physical education teacher, and actually provide the instruction given.
>
> **Indirect Adapted Physical Education Services**: Indirect services could be labeled as itinerant or consultant. Indirect services implies that you provide information, assessment or other assistance, but do not teach the children directly. The actual physical education services are taught by another person.

Report Organization

The remainder of this report is organized into four sections: Section 1 - Education; Section 2 - Job Demographics; Section 3 - Roles; and Section 4 - Training Perceptions. Within each section the text of the actual survey question is printed followed by a summary of the results. The results are presented for the total sample and then for the Formally Trained Educators (FTE) subgroup and the Other subgroup. Unless otherwise indicated in the statistical tables, the sample sizes for the three groups are: Total Sample, n = 293; FTE Group, n = 28; and Other Group, n = 265. One-way ANOVAs were used to compare mean differences and Chi Square analyses were used to compare frequency differences. Statistically significant differences are highlighted in the tables by bold print. Finally, the results of each section are summarized at the end of each section.

SECTION 1: EDUCATION

Five questions were asked regarding education and credentials possessed by the teachers responding to this survey. The objective of these questions was to determine the education profile of adapted physical education teachers responding to the survey. Although actually asked at the end of the survey, the education results are presented first to provide the reader with insight into the training and experience of the respondents. In addition, two questions were asked regarding whether teachers were interested in receiving more information and/or wanted to get involved in the Adapted Physical Education National Standards Project.

Please indicate which degrees you have earned by placing a check in the appropriate space. In addition, please indicate you major area(s) of study during each degree (Question 26 on the survey).

Review of the data summarized in Table 4 reveals that overall the sample possessed a high degree of education with 91.8% reporting undergraduate degrees and 73.1% reporting master's and 7.3% reporting doctoral degrees. While there was a significant difference between the percent of teachers with Master's degrees in the FTE and Other subgroups, this is a product of the grouping criteria. The FTE group, by definition, had to have an undergraduate degree in physical education and a master's degree in adapted physical education to be included in this group, which is confirmed by the data presented in Table 4.

Table 4.
Percent of teachers reporting earning degrees by level

Degree	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes	p
Undergraduate	91.8	100	90.9	.096
Master's	74.1	**100**	**71.3**	**.009**
Doctorate	5.5	10.7	4.9	
Other	20.1	7.1	21.5	.07

The second part of this question asked the respondents to indicate their major and minor areas of study for each degree they earned. The results in this section have been delimited to the discussion of the undergraduate and Master's degrees since only a small percent of the sample actually reported data for doctoral and other degrees. To facilitate the presentation of the data, the major and minor areas of study were dichotomized into either Physical Education or Non-Physical Education areas. Table

5 shows that the majority of the sample (79.9%) had an undergraduate major in Physical Education and approximately half (52.2) had a Physical Education related major in their Master's. As function of the grouping criteria, the FTE group had to have an undergraduate major in Physical Education and a Master's degree in Adapted Physical Education. These criteria explain the significant differences shown in Table 5 between the FTE and Other subgroups.

Table 5.
Percent of majors and minors by degree level

Degree Level/Major	Total	FTE	Other	p
Major/Undergraduate				
Did not report	8.5	0.0	9.4	
Physical Education	79.9	**100.0**	**77.0**	**.03**
Non-Physical Education	20.1	0.0	23.0	
Minor/Undergraduate				
Did not report	40.3	35.7	40.8	
Phys. Educ. Related	10.6	7.1	10.9	
Non-Physical Education	49.1	57.2	48.3	
Major/Master's				
Did not report	27.3	0.0	30.2	
Physical Education	52.2	**100.0**	**47.2**	**.000**
Non-Physical Education	20.5	0.0	22.6	
Minor/Master's				
Did not report	78.5	64.3	80.0	
Physical Education	10.6	10.7	10.6	
Non-Physical Education	10.9	25.0	9.4	

A total of 21 different undergraduate majors (e.g., therapeutic recreation, liberal arts, communication) were reported. None of the undergraduate non-physical education majors received a frequency of five percent or greater. A total of 36 undergraduate minors were reported. Two of these categories, Special Education (5.1%) and Health (16.0%) received frequencies greater than five percent.

For the Master's degree level 20 different non-physical education majors (e.g., curriculum, administration, special education) were reported. Only the major in special education (5.5%) received a frequency greater than five percent. A total of 15 non-physical education minors (e.g., English, counseling, child psychology) were reported. None of these minor areas, however, received a frequency greater than five percent.

Enter your position title (Question 27 on the survey).

A total of 32 unique responses were received in response to this question. To facilitate the interpretation of the data these responses were compressed into five categories: APE teacher, Regular Physical Education Teacher (RPE), APE Specialist, Teacher or no response. Table 6 reveals the frequency of titles reported by the three groups. Some form of Adapted Physical Education title reported by the greatest percentage (58.7%) of the teachers. This was more pronounced for the FTE group (71.4%) when compared to the Other group (57.3%), but this difference was not statistically significant (p=.12). Some form of regular physical education title was the second most commonly reported title. It should be noted that while not a significant difference, almost twice as many teachers in the Other group reported their title as being a regular physical education as did teachers in the FTE group.

Table 6.
Frequency of job titles reported.

Title	Total	FTE	Other
Did not Report	5.1	0.0	5.7
APE Teacher	58.7	71.4	57.3
RPE Teacher	20.8	10.7	21.9
Educ. Specialist	.3	0.0	.4
Teacher	4.8	0.0	5.3
Administrator	1.0	3.6	.8
Health Educ.	.3	0.0	0.4
Recreation Therapist	.3	3.6	0.0
Multiple titles	8.5	10.7	8.3

Length of time you have occupied this position (Question 28 on the survey).

Overall, the sample represented an experienced group of teachers with a mean of 9.6 (SD = 6.7) years teaching with a range from 1 to 30 years experience. The FTE group by definition had to have a minimum of 4 years of experience and actually had a mean of 9.25 (SD = 3.9) years experience with a range from 4 to 17 years. In addition, the majority of the sample (78.8%) had four or more years teaching experience. The only discernable difference between the FTE and Other subgroups on this question was that there was less variability in terms of the range of years of experience: 17 for the FTE compared to 30 for the Other group (See Table 7).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7.
Summary of years of teaching experience by group

Group	% With 0 - 3 Years	% With 4 - + Years	Range
Total	21.2	78.8	1-30
FTE	0.0	100.0	1-17
Other	23.4	76.6	1-30

Years Experience	Total	FTE	Other
0-3	21.2	0.0	23.4
4+	78.8	100.0	76.6

Does your state have an approved credential and/or endorsement validation in APE? (Question 29 on the survey)

If yes, do you have the state approved credential and/or the endorsement validation? (Question 30 on the survey)

Two questions were asked on the survey to determine if the respondents' states had an Adapted Physical Education credential or endorsement and whether the teachers had this credential. The summary data in Table 8 reveals that approximately equal numbers of teachers in the sample and each subgroup reported that their states did and did not have credentials.

Table 8.
Summary of whether States had an APE credential

Response	Total	FTE	Other
- no answer	4.4	0.0%	4.4%
- Yes	40.6%	46.4%	40.0%
- No	42.0%	46.4%	41.5%
- Don't know	13.0%	7.1%	13.6%

The data in Table 9 reveal that a little more than a third of the sample reported possessing an APE credential. Comparing the data in Tables 8 and 9 indicates that the majority of the teachers in states with credentials also possessed the credential. This was checked by crosstabing the responses of questions 8 and 9 with each other. The results of this analysis revealed that for the total sample, 82% of the teachers that

reported their state's had credentials also reported having the credential. For the FTE group, 92.3% of the teachers that reported that their state's had credentials also reported possessing the credential. Finally, for the Other group 81.1% of the teachers that reported that their states had credentials reported possessing the credential.

Table 9.
Summary of the percent of teachers in each group reporting possessing a State APE credential.

Response	Total	FTE	Other
- no answer	50.9%	42.9%	52.1%
- Yes	36.5%	46.4%	35.5
- No	12.3%	10.7%	12.5%

The last two questions on the survey asked the teachers if they would like more information regarding the APENS project and/or whether they would like to become involved in the project. If the teachers responded yes to either question, they were sent an article over viewing the project as well as an application to serve as a member of the Project's Evaluation and Review Committee. The responses to these items were not used in any other analyses related to the survey.

Send More Information about the project (Question 32)

Table 10.
Percent of respondents interested in more information regarding the project

Response	Total	FTE	Other
Yes	64.0	67.9	63.4
No	36.0	32.1	36.6

Send Information on how I can get involved (Question 33)

Table 11.
Percent of the respondents interested in becoming involved in the APENS Project

Response	Total	FTE	Other
Yes	34.6	42.9	33.6
No	65.4	57.1	66.4

Section Summary

The results presented in this section indicate that the sample overall was composed of an experienced group of teachers with an average of 10 years teaching experience in Physical Education. These teachers were well educated with over 70% of the sample possessing a Master's degree. The majority of (58%) had titles in their schools that identified them as adapted physical education specialists. Finally, the majority of teachers that reported working in states that had an Adapted Physical Education endorsement or credential, reported possessing this credential.

It is important to review at this point that the purpose of this survey was to identify the roles and perceptions of Adapted Physical Educators. A sampling procedure was specifically designed to reach this population of teachers. The results presented in this section confirm that the appropriate teachers were include in the sample. Care should be taken not to over generalize the characteristics of this sample to all teachers providing APE services, since this study did not use a random representative sample.

SECTION 2: Job Demographics

This section summarizes the teachers' responses to ten of the questions asked on the survey. These questions were designed to describe where the teachers worked, the settings they taught in, and the general characteristics of the students they served.

In which setting do you teach? (Question 31 on the survey)
___ Urban _____Non-Urban ____ Both

The summary of the responses to this question are displayed in Table 12. Review of the data reveals that a little over half (55.6%) of the sample reported working in urban schools versus 33.5% reporting working in non-urban schools. While there are some minor differences in the percentages when comparing the FTE and the Other subgroups, the proportions reporting working each setting were approximately the same.

Table 12
Percent of teachers working in Urban/Non-Urban settings by group

Response	Total	FTE	Other
- no answer	6.1%	0.0%	6.8%
- Urban	55.6%	60.7%	55.1%
- Non-Urban	33.5%	35.7%	33.2%
- Both	4.8%	3.6%	4.9%

What is the number of schools you serve and the approximate total (regular and special education) student enrollment at the school(s) you teach? (Question 1 on the survey)

Since it was anticipated that many adapted physical educators would be itinerant teachers employed to serve several schools, the first part of this question was designed to validate this assumption. The data in Table 13 reveals that a little more that half (58%) of the teachers reported working in two or more schools. The teachers reported on average to work at 4.4 schools. There were no significant differences between the FTE and Other groups on this question.

Table 13
Percent of teachers reporting working in different numbers of schools by group

GROUP	1 School	2 Schools	3+ Schools	No Resp.	Mean	SD
Total	42.0%	9.9%	41.3%	6.8%	4.4	8.4
FTE	42.9%	10.7%	46.4%	5.8	4.6	5.2
Other	41.9%	9.8%	40.8	7.5%	4.3	8.7

In an attempt to illustrate the relative size of the schools adapted physical educators were employed at as well as the number of students served, the teachers were asked to report the total student enrollment for each school they served as well as the actual number of students they served in each school (see questions 4 & 5). The total enrollment data were collapsed into five size categories and are displayed in Table 14. Means were then calculated for the number of students served across schools and the results reported in Table 15. It should be noted that since 58.0% of the sample reported working in two or more schools the means reflect multiple values from each respondent.

Table 14.
Percent of sample reporting working in various size schools

School Enrollments	Total	FTE	Other
1 thru 200	29.4	42.6	28.9
201 thru 400	16.0	10.7	16.6
401 thru 600	14.3	14.3	14.3
601 thru 800	11.3	7.1	11.7
801 and higher	12.6	17.9	12.1
no response	16.4	7.1	17.4

A secondary objective of this question was to try and estimate the number of students that should be receiving adapted physical education services versus the actual numbers being served. The plan was to compare the actual numbers reported by the teachers in questions 4 & 5 with a percentage of the total student body enrollment. Estimating that 10-12% of the student body typically qualifies for special education services and that 3-5% of the school population would have disabilities that would

require adapted physical education. To estimate the number of students that could qualify for adapted physical education services the following procedures was used. The average total school enrollment was calculated for each teacher by summing the enrollments reported and dividing by the number of different schools serviced (see Table 15). This value was then multiplied by .05 based upon the assumption that approximately five percent of the school population would qualify for adapted physical education services. This amount was then multiplied by the mean number of schools served by the teachers to get the total number of students that potentially could qualify for services. Table 15 contains the results of these computations. The results indicate that the average APE teacher should have a caseload of approximately 100 students. These estimates are discussed in more detail later in this section under questions 4 & 5 where the teachers were asked to report the actual numbers of students they were responsible for serving.

Table 15.
Calculating the Potential Number of Students that Would Qualify for APE Services Based Upon School Enrollments

Factor	Total	FTE	Other
Average Enrollment	443.8	374.6	452.1
5% Estimate	22.2	18.7	22.6
Mean # Schools	4.4	4.6	4.3
Potential # to be served	97.7	86.0	97.2

How many hours per week are you contracted to work? (Question 2 on the survey)

- **If you travel to schools, please indicate how many of these hours you spend traveling?**
- **Excluding travel time, how many hours per week do you teach Physical Education to students with disabilities (Direct Service)?**
- **Excluding travel time, how many hours per week do you provide consultation and/or support services related to Adapted Physical Education to students with disabilities (Indirect Services)?**
- **Excluding travel time, how many hours per week of you work time do you spend outside of Adapted Physical Education? Briefly explain these outside responsibilities that you perform during the school week:**

This question was composed of five parts. The first part requested the total number of hours worked. The second and third parts requested the number of hours a week the teachers spent

actually providing direct and indirect adapted physical education services to students with disabilities. The last two parts of the question requested information regarding the number of hours spent traveling between schools and performing duties outside of teaching adapted physical education. A total of 293 teachers responded to this question (see Table 16). It is important to stress here that direct and indirect APE services were explicitly defined on the survey. Of this total, 6.5%(n=19) of the sample did not provide any direct services and 41.0%(n=120) of the sample did not provide any indirect services. Evaluation of the data listed in Table 16 revealed that the FTE group spent significantly more time (Mean=26.8 hours) on the average each week providing direct service than did the Other APE teacher group (Mean=17.8 hours). Conversely, the Other APE teachers spent more time (Mean=14.1 hours) each week on outside responsibilities compared to the FTE teacher group (Mean=9.6 hours), although this difference was not statistically significant. Approximately half (51.5%) of the teachers reported time for travel between schools which is consistent with the multiple number schools reported in question one. In terms of outside time, 38.6%(n=113) of the teachers reported not having work responsibilities outside of adapted physical education (see Table 17). The 61% of the teachers that did report having outside work responsibilities were asked to describe the nature of their outside work assignments. These explanations were coded into 36 categories. The outside assignments that were reported and that received frequencies greater than 5% were: Administrative Work (5.8%), Teaching Regular Physical Education (12.3%), Special Olympics (5.1%), and Multiple Responses (21.8%).

Table 16.
Descriptive data on question 1: Number of hours worked per week.

	Total Sample			FTE			Other			
	Mean	SD	Ran	Mean	SD	Ran	Mean	SD	Ran	p
Total Hrs./Week	36.1	6.9	45	36.2	8.0	44	36.1	6.7	45	
Direct Hrs	18.7	10.7	44	**26.8**	**8.9**	**40**	**17.8**	**10.5**	**39**	**.000**
Indirect Hrs	9.5	10.4	39	11.6	9.1	29	9.3	10.5	39	
Travel Hrs	5.5	5.1	31	4.9	4.1	14	5.6	5.2	31	
Outside Hrs	13.7	12.7	49	9.6	9.5	33	14.1	12.9	49	

Table 17 summarizes the percentage of the sample that reported no hours for each of the requested time categories. Review of the overall data reveals that 93.5% (100%-6.5%) spent at least some of their time providing direct service where as 41.0% of sample did not report spending any time providing indirect services. Approximately

half the sample did not report any travel hours. Finally, a third of the total sample did not report any outside hours. When comparing the FTE and Other subgroups, the only major difference was in relation to outside hours, where 53.6% of the FTE group did not report any outside hours compared to only 37% of the Other group.

Table 17.
Percent of teachers not reporting hours for one or more of the requested categories

Time Category	Total	FTE	Other
% Reporting no Direct Hours	6.6	3.6	6.8
% Reporting no Indirect Hours	41.0	42.9	40.8
% Reporting no Travel Hours	48.5	42.9	49.1
% Reporting no Outside Hours	38.6	53.6	37.0

At which of the following school levels do you work: infant (0-2 yrs), preschool (3-5 yrs), elementary (6-12 yrs), middle/Jr. high (13-15 yrs), high school (16-21)? (Question 3 on the survey)

This was a yes/no question and teachers were asked to indicate all of the levels that they served. The data presented below in Table 18 reflects the percent of the sample that indicated that they served students in a given age range. The only noticeable difference between the FTE and Other groups that approached significance was found at the preschool level. At this level the teachers in the FTE group indicated significantly greater involvement (64.3%) than the teachers in the Other group (47.9%). Overall, it appears that there is only minimal involvement of adapted physical educators at the infant level. This may be a reflection of how different states are using schools as the primary sites for implementing part b/h of IDEA.

Table 18.
Percentage of adapted physical educators reporting working at each education level.

Age Category	Total % Yes	APE % Yes	Other % Yes	p
0-2	4.4	7.1	4.2	
3-5	49.5	**64.3**	**47.9**	**.09**
6-12	84.0	85.7	83.8	
13-15	70.3	78.6	69.4	
16-21	63.8	71.4	63.0	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How many students with disabilities do you provide direct Adapted Physical Education? (Question 4 on the survey)

How many students with disabilities do you provide indirect Adapted Physical Education? (Question 5 on the survey)

Two questions were asked to ascertain the number of students that APE teachers were providing direct and indirect services to. These numbers were then used as references in subsequent questions. As previously discussed under the format of the survey, the terms direct and indirect services were explicitly defined on the survey for the teachers. The data in Table 19 reveals that overall the adapted physical educators reported providing direct services to twice as many students as they provide indirect services to. Interestingly, the teachers in the FTE group reported providing direct services to approximately three times as many students as they provided indirect services to. Comparison of the FTE group with the Other group shows that the FTE also reported providing direct services to a significantly greater number of students (Mean=106.5) than the teachers in the Other group (Mean=66.3). While the FTE group appeared to provide indirect services to slightly more students (Mean=36.2) as compared to the Other teachers (Mean=33.2) this difference was not statistically significant. It should be noted by the n's reported in Table 19 that 96.4% of the FTE group and 93.6% of the Other group reported providing direct services compared to only 57.1% and 59.2% reporting respectively that they provided indirect services. These data suggest that adapted physical educators are still major direct service providers. This trend is noteworthy given the national attention and emphasis on consultant models which could increase the role of adapted physical educators in providing indirect services.

Table 19.
Descriptive statistics on the numbers of students provided direct and indirect adapted physical education services

Direct Service	Mean	SD	Range
Total Sample(n=275; 93.9%)	70.3	73.2	499
FTE (n=27; 96.4%)	**106.5***	**103.9**	465
Other (n=248; 93.6%)	**66.3**	**68.2**	499
Indirect Service	**Mean**	**SD**	**Range**
Total Sample(n=173; 59.0%)	33.5	64.4	409
FTE (n=16; 57.1%)	36.2	49.9	197
Other (n=157; 59.2%)	33.2	66.1	409

*Significant at the .006 level.

Under the results for Question 1 of the survey, discussed earlier in this section, projected caseloads were predicted based on the school enrollments the teachers reported. These projections are compared to the actual numbers reported by the teachers in Table 20. Overall the projections based on school enrollments were fairly accurate, although they slightly underestimated the loads actually reported by the teachers. This tendency to underestimate was most pronounced for the FTE group which reported serving significantly more students directly.

Table 20.
Comparison of Teacher Reported and Projected Caseloads

Numbers Reported	Total	FTE	Other
# Students Served Directly	70.3	106.5	66.3
# Students Served Indirectly	33.5	36.2	33.2
# Students Served Total	103.8	142.7	99.5
Projected # based on school enrollments Question #2	97.7	86.0	97.2

Considering their degree of motor delay, how many of the students that you provide direct Adapted Physical Education to would you place in the following categories: 1-2 years of delay, 3-4 years of delay, 5-6 years of delay, more than 6 years of delay? (Question 6 on the survey)

Considering their degree of motor delay, how many of the students that you provide indirect Adapted Physical Education to would you place in the following categories: 1-2 years of delay, 3-4 years of delay, 5-6 years of delay, more than 6 years of delay? (Question 7 on the survey)

Questions 6 and 7 asked the teachers to report the number of students they provided direct and indirect services to by degree of motor delay. The objective of these questions was to ascertain the severity of the disabilities that the teachers were working with. Years of motor delay was selected as the method to categorize the degree of disability in an attempt to avoid differences in local definitions of labels such as mild, moderate, severe, etc. It should also be noted that if the numbers reported by the teachers did not sum to the total numbers reported in questions 4 and 5 their data were not included in this analysis. Table 21 reveals that the FTE

teachers tended to provide direct instruction to slightly larger numbers of students in all of the motor delay categories than the teachers in the Other group. These differences were statistically significant for only the 1-2 year delay category. Overall, the teachers in this sample appeared to work with approximately equal numbers of students in each category. These data should not be misinterpreted as class sizes. This question simply asked for the number of students worked with in each category not how many were worked with at a given time.

The distribution of students by degree of motor delay receiving indirect services is also reported in Table 21. It is important to recall that a significant number of the teachers reported not providing indirect services and that, in addition, if the numbers reported in this question did not sum to the totals provided in question 5 their responses were not included in this analysis. Review of the data indicates a clear trend for the FTE group between the number of students provided indirect services and the degree of motor delay with greater numbers of students with milder delays receiving indirect services. These results intuitively make sense. Students with milder disabilities were probably placed in regular physical education classes and the services of the adapted physical educator were limited to assisting the regular physical education teachers in addressing the needs of these students. As the degree of motor delay increased, greater expertise was needed in order to address the needs of these students, so these students received direct rather than indirect APE services. The trend for the Other subgroup was not as clear. These teachers appeared to serve equal numbers within each delay category with the numbers gradually increasing as the degree of delay increased. These results are hard to interpret directly. One possible explanation is that 21.9% of the teachers in the Other group compared to only 10.7% of the teachers in the FTE group (see Table 6) reported their title's as being regular physical educators. It may be that these teachers primarily worked with students with minor delays (1-4 years) within their regular physical education classes and were responsible for the students with major delays (4+ years) that were in their classes and the classes of other physical educators within the schools they served?

Table 21.
Mean number of students provided direct and indirect adapted physical education services by degree of motor delay.

	DIRECT		INDIRECT	
Sample/Delay	% Serving	Mean Number of Students	% Serving	Mean Number of Students

Total Sample				
1-2 years	68.3	25.9	37.2	11.2
3-4 years	73.7	18.6	28.0	8.5
5-6 years	59.4	16.4	17.1	12.3
+6 years	59.4	21.6	15.4	18.6
FTE Group				
1-2 years	71.4	**37.5***	46.4	**24.6****
3-4 years	78.6	23.4	21.4	**16.2*****
5-6 years	75.0	16.9	17.9	13.6
+6 years	53.6	28.0	10.7	11.7
Other Group				
1-2 years	67.9	**24.6**	35.1	**9.3**
3-4 years	73.2	18.1	28.7	**7.9**
5-6 years	57.7	16.3	17.0	12.2
+6 years	60.0	21.0	15.8	18.6

Significant: * .08
** .00
*** .06

Of the students for whom you provide Direct (Question 8 on the survey) and Indirect (Question 9 on the survey) Adapted Physical Education services, indicate the number that are in the following age groups: 0-2 years (infants), 3-5 years (preschool), 6-12 years (elementary), 13-15 years (middle/JrHigh), 16-21 years (HS).

This question paralleled the age groups used in Question 3 on the survey and reported earlier in this section. The focus of these follow-up questions was to determine the actual numbers of students provided direct and indirect services within each of the age groups. The data presented in Table 22 should be viewed in light of the percent of the groups responding. For example, only two percent of the sample reported serving students directly in the 0-2 age group. Of these six teachers five reported serving 10 students or less and one teacher reported serving 50 students. With this small number of respondents, the one extreme score had a marked impact on the mean number of students served.

Overall, these data indicate that the sample was most involved with the school aged populations with the elementary level receiving the greatest attention within these groups. While less than the school age groups, the preschool age group received reasonable attention and indicates that schools are becoming aware of their responsibilities to serve this population. Given that many states do not require physical education to be taught by a physical education specialist at the elementary level, it is encouraging to see that,

at least in the schools served by these teachers, specialists were being used at both the preschool and elementary levels. Examining just the sample total data for both direct and indirect services reveals an interesting trend -- the greatest numbers are served at the elementary level and then the numbers incrementally decline for the middle school and high school levels. Hopefully this is an indication that early intervention at the elementary level is leading to greater numbers of students with disabilities being able to return to the regular physical education curriculum during their later years of schooling. Finally, there appears to only be limited involvement at the infant level. This involvement is hard to interpret directly because many states may not be using schools as the primary sites for addressing the needs of this age group.

Comparison of the FTE and Other subgroups reveals similar trends across the age levels. Although a greater percentage of the FTE group teachers appeared to be working and serving more students at each age level when compared to the Other group, there were no statistically significant differences between the groups.

Table 22.
Number of students served and percent of sample providing instruction across age levels

Total Sample

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	2.0	12.6	50
3-5	39.6	19.4	89
6-12	75.1	29.1	107
13-15	60.4	16.5	74
16-21	50.2	27.9	169

FTE Group

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	0.0	0.0	0
3-5	53.6	24.4	78
6-12	78.6	34.7	95
13-15	64.3	17.6	47
16-21	53.6	41.1	148

Other Group

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	2.3	12.6	50

3-5	38.1	18.7	89
6-12	74.7	28.4	107
13-15	60.0	16.3	74
16-21	49.8	26.4	169

Indirect Service

Total Sample

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	1.7	10.0	25
3-5	12.5	16.0	76
6-12	42.7	15.6	99
13-15	25.9	10.8	127
16-21	19.8	13.8	74

FTE Group

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	0.0	0.0	0
3-5	14.3	28.5	51
6-12	39.3	23.5	99
13-15	21.4	11.5	23
16-21	25.0	10.6	30

Other Group

Age Group	% Sample Providing	Mean # Served	Range
0-2	1.7	10.0	25
3-5	12.1	14.4	76
6-12	43.0	14.8	99
13-15	26.4	10.7	127
16-21	19.2	14.2	74

Section Summary

Overall, the sample worked in more urban (56%) than non-urban (34%) schools. Teachers reported working in 1-15 different schools with half the sample reporting working in two or more schools and mean of 4.4 schools per teacher. Teachers reported working in schools with a wide range of enrollments with the average enrollment being 444 students per school. In terms of how the teachers work time was divided up across a typical week, the majority (52%) of their time was spent providing direct adapted physical education services to students with disabilities. The remainder of their time

was divided among providing indirect APE services (26%), outside responsibilities (38%) and travel between schools (15%). These summary data should be viewed cautiously since the sum of many of the teachers' time estimates on the subparts of this question (e.g., travel, outside, direct, etc.) totaled to more than the number hours they reported working each week?

For both direct and indirect services, teachers reported working with the full spectrum of ages (infants - high school) and with all degrees of disability. Within the age groups served, the elementary aged population received the greatest emphasis (75%) and the infant group (2%) the least. There was also a noticeable trend of the highest adapted physical education involvement at the elementary level and then a gradual decrease in involvement as student age increases. In terms of degree of delay, the teachers appeared to be serving proportionally equal numbers of students within each delay category with more students in each delay category receiving direct services than indirect services.

SECTION 3: ROLES

This section of the survey was designed to ascertain the status of adapted physical education services, the roles teachers performed in relation to adapted physical education services and what staff development activities were provided.

What Physical Education placements are available in your school? (Question 10 on the survey)

- **Combination of Regular and Adapted Physical Education**
- **Special Olympics/Sports for the Disabled <u>in addition</u> to Physical Education**
- **Related services (Physical & Occupational Therapy)**
- **Regular Physical Education with support services in Adapted Physical Education**
- **Special Olympics/Disabled Sports <u>in place</u> of Physical Education**
- **Regular physical Education only**
- **Adapted Physical Education only**
- **Other, please specify**

The values reported in Table 23 represent the % of the sample that answered "yes" to the question. Teachers were asked to check all that applied. The placement options have been rearranged in Table 23 and listed from the placements that were indicated as the most available to those that were least available. Review of the data in Table 23 reveals that the most prevalent physical education placement option was related services available in more than 80 percent of the teachers' schools. While it is possible that teachers misread the question and erroneously checked related services as a physical education service just because it was available and not because it was used as a physical education placement, this result is alarming. Second to related services was some combination of regular physical education and adapted physical education which was available in two-thirds of the schools. On a positive note, Special Olympics was only reported as a substitute for physical education by 3.4 percent of the sample and less than a third of the sample reported regular physical education as being the only placement option. Overall these data indicate that while there is some evidence of a continuum of placements being available in some sites, there are clearly some misconceptions regarding the concept of a continuum of placements for physical education in many of these schools.

Table 23
Placement options indicated listed in rank order

Response	Placement Options Available Total	FTE	Other
Related Services	82.9	85.7	82.6
Combination RPE & APE	67.6	57.1	68.7
Special Olympics/Sports in addition to PE	58.7	57.1	58.9
RPE w/ APE Support	54.9	57.1	54.7
APE only	51.2	67.9	49.4
RPE only	29.0	28.6	29.1
Other	15.7	17.9	15.5
Special Olympics/Sport in place of PE	3.4	0.0	3.8

As indicated in Table 23, 15.7% of the teachers indicated that other options were available. These other placements were coded into one of nine categories. Table 24 contains a summary of the other options provided by the teachers listed in order of prevalence. As can be seen from reviewing the data none of these additional placements were reported by 5 percent of the sample.

Table 24.
Percent reporting other placement options listed in rank order

Response	Total	FTE	Other
No answer	84.6	82.1	84.9
Other	7.2	10.7	6.8
Recreation Programs	2.4	3.6	2.3
RPE with APE	1.7	0.0	1.9
Motor Development	1.4	0.0	1.5
Specially Designed PE	1.0	3.6	7.5
Swimming	1.0	0.0	7.5
Various Therapies	0.0	0.0	.4
Computer Instruction	0.0	0.0	.4

Are any of the following used in place of Physical Education in your school? (Question 11 on the survey)

Special Olympics/Disabled Sports <u>in place of</u> Physical Education
Supervised recess <u>in place of</u> Physical Education
Related services <u>in place of</u> Physical Education (Physical & Occupational Therapy)
Other, please specify

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This question was asked as follow up to question 10 and was designed specifically to identify what placements were being used as substitutes for physical education. The data in Table 25 represents the percent of the sample that answered "yes" to each option being used in place of physical education. Teachers were asked to check all that applied.

Table 25.
Placement options used in place of physical education listed in rank order

Response	Total	FTE	Other
Related Services	13.0	3.6	14.0
Recess	6.8	0.0	7.5
Other	5.8	3.6	6.0
Special Olympics/Sport for Disabled	1.4	0.0	1.5

Clearly related services was the most common substitute used as a replacement for physical education followed by recess and Special Olympics. While 5.8% of the teachers reported that other options were used as substitutes in their schools, Table 26 reveals that none of these alternatives had a frequency of greater than 5%.

Table 26.
Percent reporting other placements used in place of physical education listed in rank order

Response	Total	FTE	Other
No answer	93.5	96.4	93.2
Other	3.4	3.6	3.4
PE for only part ...	0.0	0.0	.8
PE without a licence	0.0	0.0	.4
APE only	0.0	0.0	.4
Classroom teacher	0.0	0.0	.4
PE called Motor Dev.	0.0	0.0	.4
Recreation	0.0	0.0	.4

For the students you teach directly, indicate the percentage for whom you are usually involved in each of the following processes: Eligibility for Services, Placement Decisions, IEP Decisions, Instructional Content. Please check the appropriate box for each selection. (Question 12 on the survey)

For this question the teachers were asked to check the

percentage category (none, <25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76%+) that represented their involvement in each of four decision making processes for the students they served directly. Review of the data in Table 27 reveals that less than half the teachers were involved in eligibility and placement decisions for the majority of their students. Teacher involvment increased with IEP decisions and was the highest for instructional decisions. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, the only significant difference was that the FTE teachers were more involved in eligibility decisions.

Table 27.
Percent of Sample Reporting being involved in each process for students provided direct services

Total Sample

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	28.7	12.6	8.5	4.4	45.7
Placement	25.9	14.0	7.5	7.8	44.7
IEP	15.0	10.2	3.0	7.8	63.8
Instruction	12.3	3.4	2.4	2.4	79.5

FTE Group

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	21.4	7.1	7.1	0.0	64.3
Placement	32.1	3.6	3.6	10.7	50.0
IEP	10.7	14.3	0.0	14.3	60.7
Instruction	7.1	3.6	10.7	0.0	78.6

Other Group

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	29.4	13.2	8.7	4.9	43.8
Placement	25.3	15.1	7.9	7.5	44.1
IEP	15.5	9.8	3.4	7.2	64.2
Instruction	12.8	3.4	1.5	2.6	79.6

For the students you teach indirectly, indicate the percentage for whom you are usually involved in each of the following processes: Eligibility for Services, Placement Decisions, IEP Decisions, Instructional Content. Please check the appropriate box for each selection. (Question 13 on the survey)

This question paralleled the previous question and asked the teachers to check the percentage category (none, <25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76%+) that represented their involvement in each of four decision making processes for the students they served indirectly. Review of the data in Table 28 reveals the overall less than a third of the teachers were involved in any of these decision making processes for the majority of the students they served directly. The teachers that were involved appeared to be equally involved in all four decision pocesses. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, the FTE group was significantly more involved in all of the decision processes.

Table 28.
Percent of Sample Reporting being involved in each process for students provided indirect services

Total Sample

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	55.6	6.5	4.4	4.8	28.7
Placement	53.6	8.9	4.8	8.5	24.2
IEP	51.1	7.2	5.8	5.5	30.4
Instruction	49.8	11.3	6.8	5.1	27.0

FTE Group

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	39.3	0.0	10.7	7.1	42.9
Placement	39.3	3.6	7.1	14.3	35.7
IEP	35.7	3.6	10.7	10.7	39.3
Instruction	39.3	7.1	10.7	7.1	35.7

Other Group

Process	None	<25%	26-50%	51-75%	76%+
Eligibility	57.4	7.2	3.8	4.5	27.2
Placement	55.1	9.4	4.5	7.9	23.0
IEP	52.8	7.5	5.3	4.9	29.4
Instruction	50.9	11.7	6.4	4.9	26.0

Teachers were asked to specify if they did not make these decision who did and why. Table 29 indicates that 24.9% of the respondents specified who made the decisions. Table 30 shows that 12.6% of the teachers specified why they were not involved and/or who made these decisions in their schools. The two "who did" groups who received a frequency over 5% were: Review Team (8.2%) and Administration (5.8%). No "why" options received a frequency of over 5%.

Table 29.
Who was responsible for making decisions, if not made by the adapted physical educator

Response	Total	FTE	Other
No answer	75.1	82.1	74.3
Team	8.2		9.1
Administration	5.8	10.7	6.4
Classroom Teacher	2.4		2.6
APE Resource	1.4		1.5
Preset Curriculum	1.0		1.1
Parents & Teachers	1.0		1.1
RPE Teacher	1.0	3.6	1.1
Staff Committee	.7		.7
Spec. Ed. Teacher	.7		.7
Counselor	.7		.7
Consultants	.7	3.6	.7
PE coordinator	.3		.4
RPE teacher only	.3		.4
PE teacher or ...	.3		.4
Parents	.3		.4

Table 30.
Reasons given why others made the decisions

Response	Total	FTE	Other
No answer	87.4	85.7	87.5
Special School	2.7	3.6	2.6
No APE Consultant	1.7	3.6	1.5
State Guidelines	1.4	3.6	1.1
Admin & Spec Ed	1.4	0.0	1.5
Poor communication	1.4	0.0	1.5
Students Included	1.0	3.6	.7
Respondent?	.7	0.0	.7
APE teacher	.3	0.0	.4
Academic Classroom	.3	0.0	.4
Location of School	.3	0.0	.4

APE a related serv.	.3	0.0	.4
Early intervention	.3	0.0	.4
APE consulted	.3	0.0	.4
Inclusion	.3	0.0	.4

If you are usually involved in making placement decisions for students who receive Adapted Physical Education, which of the following do you usually use (Check all that apply)? (Question 14 on the survey)

I do not make these decisions
Reports given at IEP meetings
Informal comments from parents
Informal comments from other teachers
Weekly or monthly progress reports
Criterion Referenced tests
Norm Referenced tests (Standardized)
Professional judgement
Comparing entrance & exit criteria
Physical Education teachers' input
Other, please list

The goal of this question was determine what sources of information teachers used to make placement decisions. The teachers were asked to indicate all of the sources they used. The sources are listed in Table 31 in rank order from those that were used most to least by the teachers. For the total sample, professional judgement clearly was the most commonly used for making placement decisions. Further examination of the results reveals that only 43.3% of the teachers reported using criterion referenced tests and 40.3% reported using norm referenced tests. These results are concerning given that federal regulations require that placement decisions be supported by standardized test data. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, the only significant difference was that the teachers in the FTE group reported using criterion reference tests more frequently than the teachers in the other group.

Table 31.
What sources of information are used to make decisions

Source	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes	p
Professional judgement	65.9	67.8	65.7	
IEP Reports	54.9	50.0	55.5	
PE teachers input	50.2	53.6	49.8	
Other teacher comments	49.1	42.9	49.8	
CRTs	43.3	**60.7**	**41.5**	**.05**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Parent comments	40.6	39.3	40.7
NRTs	40.3	42.9	40.0
Weekly/monthly reports	29.3	28.6	29.4
Entrance/Exit criteria	29.0	32.1	28.7
Do not make decision	18.1	14.3	18.5
Other	17.4	10.7	18.1

If the teachers indicated they used other sources, they were asked to describe these sources. As shown in Table 31, 17.4% of the teachers specified other sources such as district curricula, PT/OT referrals and IEP goals, but none of these responses received a frequency of more than 5%.

What criteria do you usually use in deciding what Adapted Physical Education instructional content should be taught (Check those that apply to your situation)? (Question 15 on the survey)

Adapted Physical Education Curriculum
Regular Physical Education Curriculum
Professional judgement
Checklist of pre-set activities
The ability of the student
Parents requests
Student's projected recreational needs
Assessment data
Classroom teacher suggestions
Time available for instruction
Facilities available
Special Education label
Student's past and current recreation needs
Student's interest
Other, please list

The objective of this question was to determine what sources of information teachers used when making instructional decisions. The results are list in order from highest to lowest in Table 32. Clearly, student ability and professional judgement where the two most common criteria used by the teachers. While use of assessment data was the third highest, it was only reported by 68.6% of the teachers. While this high use of assessment data for making instructional decisions is encouraging, it is interesting the discrepancy between the use of assessment data and student ability. This raises the question of how student ability is determined in 88.4% of the cases when assessment data is only available in 68.6% of the cases. When comparing the FTE and Other group responses on this item, there were not significant differences. The Other teachers did check the Other category slightly more than the FTE group.

Table 32.
What criteria are used in selecting adapted physical education instructional content?

Criteria	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes
Student Ability	88.4	92.9	87.9
Professional Judgement	85.0	85.7	84.9
Assessment Data	68.6	71.4	68.3
Student Interests	66.6	67.9	66.4
Facilities Available	66.2	71.4	65.7
RPE Curriculum	61.4	60.7	61.5
Projected Rec Needs	58.7	60.7	58.5
APE Curriculum	51.5	53.6	51.3
Parent Request	49.1	53.6	48.7
Past & Current Needs	46.1	46.4	46.0
Time Available	43.0	39.3	43.4
Teacher Suggestions	36.2	32.1	36.6
Activity Checklist	21.5	17.9	21.9
Other	14.7	7.1	15.5
Special Ed. Label	8.9	7.1	9.0

As indicated in Table 32, 14.7% of the teachers specified other criteria such as space available, PT/OT input, socialization needs and doctor recommendations, however, none of these received a frequency of greater than 5%.

What issues have you been asked to explain to others in relation to the profession of Adapted Physical Education (check those that apply)? (Question 16 on the survey)

What is Adapted Physical Education?
The difference between Adapted and Regular Physical Education
The difference between Adapted Physical Education and related services (e.g., physical therapy)
The role of the Adapted Physical Education teacher
Identifying children who need Adapted Physical Education
Other, please list

In this item, the teachers were given a list of APE issues and asked to indicate which ones they had been asked to address in their schools. The results in Table 33 reveal that the majority of the teachers (66-76%) had been asked to address all of the issues. When comparing the FTE and Other group it appears that the FTE teachers were called upon to address these issues slightly more than the teachers in the Other group. However, there was only a sigificant difference between the two groups on the topic of "differences

between adapted physical education and related services."

Table 33.
Issues listed in rank order that adapted physical educators are asked to address

Issue(n=316)	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes	p
What is APE?	76.8	71.4	77.4	
Identifying children who need APE services	68.9	75.0	68.3	
Difference b/w APE & RPE	67.6	78.6	66.4	
Difference b/w APE & Related Services	66.9	**85.7**	**64.9**	**.026**
Role of the APE teacher	66.2	78.6	64.9	
Other	19.5	21.4	19.2	

When asked if they were called upon to address other issues, 19.5% of the teachers specified other issues. Several issues such as how to adapt activities, Special Olympics and assessment, were reported, but none received a frequency of greater than 5%.

What other responsibilities, outside of your duties as an Adapted Physical Educator do you have in your school (check those that apply)? (Question 17 on the survey)

After school programs
Before school programs
Fund raising
Coaching Disabled Sports
Other teaching responsibilities
Curriculum committees
Athletic Training
CPR Training
Administrative duties
Bus/lunch duties
Other coaching responsibilities
Other, please list

This question was designed to identify what other responsibilities teachers were asked to perform in their schools. The responses are listed in Table 34 from highest to lowest. Working on curriculum committees and coaching disabled sports were the two most commonly reported outside responsibilities. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, there were no notable differences between the groups on this item.

Table 34.
Outside responsibilities reported by teachers listed in rank order

Responsibility(n=316)	Total %Yes	Ape %Yes	Other %Yes	p
Curriculum Committees	47.4	46.4	47.5	
Coaching Disabled Sport	36.5	50.0	35.1	
Other	33.8	42.8	32.8	
After school programs	32.8	32.1	32.8	
Other teaching	32.4	25.0	33.2	
Bus/lunch duty	31.7	25.0	32.4	
Other coaching	23.5	25.0	23.3	
Fund raising	21.8	21.4	21.9	
CPR Training	20.4	25.0	20.0	
Administrative duties	18.8	14.3	19.2	
Athletic Training	6.5	7.1	6.4	
Before school programs	5.8	3.6	6.0	

As indicated in Table 34, 33.8% of the teachers specified other outside responsibilities. Of these, only Special Olympics (6.1%) and staff development (5.8%) received frequencies greater than 5%.

When do you usually perform assessments for your students with disabilities that you serve in the regular physical education setting (check all that apply)? (Question 18 on the survey)

The purpose of this question was to determine when students that were taught both directly and indirectly in the regular physical education setting were assessed. The data in the first part of Table 35 reveals that less than half of the teachers reported performing on-going assessment for the students they served directly and approximately a fifth of the teachers reported not assessing their students because they were not required to or only when requested. The results were similar only more pronounced in terms of the teachers lack of involvement for the students they served indirectly. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, there were no significant differences between the groups.

Table 35.
When do you assess your students?

For Students Served Directly

Options	Total	APE	Other
On-going assessment	48.8	46.4	49.1
Not required to assess	22.7	17.9	23.4
Prior to entry in RPE	22.5	28.6	21.9

Only when requested	18.4	7.1	19.6
Other	14.0	3.6	15.1

For Students Served Indirectly

Options	Total	APE	Other
On-going assessment	21.8	35.7	20.4
Only when requested	18.4	10.7	19.2
Prior to entry in RPE	14.3	25.0	13.2
Not required to assess	13.6	10.7	14.0
Other	8.5	7.1	8.7

As part of this item, teachers were asked to report other assessment schedules. Approximately 14% of the teachers specified other "direct" responsibilities and 8.5% specified "indirect" assessment schedules such as 3-4 times a year, annually and pre/post units, however, none received frequencies greater than 5%.

How do you usually assess students with disabilities in the regular physical education setting?(check those that apply) (Question 19 on the survey)

This item was a follow-up to Question 19 and was designed to determine how teachers assessed their students in the regular physical education setting. The results in Table 36 reveal that for the students taught directly in regular physical education settings, informal assessment and on-going assessment were the two most common methods reported by 41.3% and 39.9% of the teachers respectively. Again it is note worthy that 23.5% of the teachers reported that they did not assess their students because they were not required to. The pattern of results for the students taught indirectly were similar although the frequency reported for each method was noticeably less with less than a third of the teachers indicating using any of the methods. When comparing the FTE and Other groups, there were no significant differences between them on these factors.

Table 36.
What means do you use to collect assessment data on the students you teach?

For Students Served Directly

Options	Total	APE	Other
Informal assess.	41.3	32.1	42.3
On-going Assess.	39.9	42.6	39.6
Input from others	30.0	21.4	30.9
NRTs	28.0	25.0	28.3

Not req'd to assess	23.5	21.4	17.3
Other	9.9	7.1	10.1

For Students Served Indirectly

Options	Total	APE	Other
Informal assess.	29.7	39.3	28.7
Input from others	23.2	39.3	21.5
On-going Assess.	22.2	35.7	20.7
NRTs	18.4	25.0	17.7
Not req'd to assess	12.6	7.1	13.2
Other	7.2	7.1	7.2

Table 36 reveals that 9.9% of the teachers specified other forms such as observation, report cards and curriculum-based assessment with "direct" students and 7.2% specified other forms used with "indirect" students, however, none of the forms received frequencies greater than 5%.

How do you usually assist in transitioning special education students into regular physical education and/or other settings?(check all that apply) (Question 20 on the survey)

This item was designed to determine the degree to which the teachers were involved in transitioning students. The results for this item are displayed in Table 37. Overall, less than a third of the teachers were involved in any aspect of transitioning for the students they served directly and indirectly. When the teachers were involved, the most common form of involvement was in the form of assisting regular physical educators with transition planning. Although not statistically significant, the FTE teachers appeared to be slightly more involved in transition activities than the teachers in the Other group.

Table 37.
How are you involved in the transition process?

For students taught Directly

Options	Total	FTE	Other
Assist RPE with planning	33.4	50.0	31.7
Design transition plans-PE	22.2	28.0	21.9
Not involved in process	19.1	14.3	19.6
Design lesson plans for RPE	14.3	17.9	14.0
Other	17.7	7.1	18.9

For students taught Indirectly

Options	Total	FTE	Other

Assist RPE with planning	28.7	46.4	26.8
Other	17.7	10.7	18.5
Design transition plans-PE	16.4	17.9	16.2
Design lesson plans for RPE	10.9	10.7	10.9
Not involved in process	8.5	3.6	9.0

The results in Table 37 reveal that 17.7% of the teachers specified other methods such as collaboration, peer modeling and mainstreaming for students served both "directly" and "indirectly," however, none of the methods received frequencies greater than 5%.

For what staff development issues or activities have you been asked to provide information?(check all that apply) (Question 21 on the survey)

This item was designed to determine what staff development topics teachers had been asked to address in their schools. The results displayed in Table 38 reveal that the teachers were heavily involved in providing staff development. More than half the teachers reported staff development activities on Adapted games & activities, Adaptive equipment, Accommodations for RPE, IEP, Writing goals & objectives, Special Olympics, and Motor development. Clearly there is a great demand for adapted physical educators to provide staff development activities in their schools.

Table 38.
Staff development issues teachers asked to address

Topics	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes	p
Adapted games & activities	79.2	78.6	79.2	
Adaptive equipment	66.6	75.0	65.7	
Accommodations for RPE	59.4	60.7	59.2	
IEP	58.7	57.1	58.9	
Writing goals & objectives	58.0	53.6	58.5	
Special Olympics	56.7	57.1	56.6	
Motor development	51.2	57.1	50.6	
Assessment	48.5	67.9	46.2	.03
Behavior management	44.4	42.6	44.5	
Inclusion	41.3	50.0	40.4	
Safety	40.3	50.0	39.2	
Adapted aquatics	40.3	57.1	38.5	.05
Integration	38.2	60.7	35.8	.01
Disabilities	34.1	50.0	32.4	.06
Disabled sport	25.6	35.7	24.5	
Wheelchair games	23.9	35.7	22.6	

Transition plans	23.5	25.0	23.4	
Early childhood intervention	23.2	35.7	21.9	.09
Legal mandate issues	21.5	21.4	21.5	
Wheelchair basketball	8.9	14.3	8.3	
Other	7.8	21.4	6.4	.005
Indiv. family service plans	5.8	3.6	6.0	

In addition to the topics provided, 7.8% of the respondents (21.4% of the FTE group and 6.4% of the Other group) specified other topics such as using playground equipment, peer tutoring and curriculum development, however, none of the methods received frequencies greater than 5%.

Please describe how adapted physical education is usually conducted in your school district. Include in this description information about eligibility, placement, instructional decisions and assessment. (Question 24 on the survey)

This was a free response item where the teachers could just describe how APE was conducted in their schools. The percentage of teachers responding to each of the four criteria (eligibility, placement, instructional decisions and assessment) are reported in Table 39. The results indicate that the majority of the teachers provide some information on each criteria. To aid in the interpretation of the responses, the information provided by the teachers under each criteria were collapsed into 9 categories as displayed in Table 40. Excluding the "no answer" and the "other" categories, Special Education and/or ARD committees and the use of assessment results were the two most common methods reported for how eligibility decisions were made. In terms of Placement Decisions, the use of the Special Education and/or ARD Committee was the most notable method used. For instructional and assessment decisions, the use of the APE staff and a Team Approach were the two most common methods. Overall, there were no significant difference between the FTE and Other groups on these items.

Table 39.
Percent of teachers reporting information on how adapted physical education was provided in their schools

Item	Total %Yes	FTE %Yes	Other %Yes
Eligibility	84.5	82.1	84.5
Placement	79.2	78.6	79.2
Instructional decisions	79.2	78.6	79.2
Assessment	80.2	82.1	80.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 40.
Percent of teachers reporting being involved in the identified processes

Eligibility:	% Responding Yes Total	FTE	Other
0 no answer	15.7	17.9	15.5
1 APE staff testing	4.4	3.6	4.5
2 IEP or Special Ed. criteria	6.1	10.7	5.7
3 Student lack of progress	3.1	3.6	3.0
4 Physical condition	5.1	3.6	5.2
5 Assessment results	11.3	10.7	11.3
6 Student referral	8.9	7.1	9.1
7 Special Ed. or ARD team	13.0	7.1	13.6
8 Fine & Gross motor	2.0	3.6	2.0
9 Other	30.4	32.1	30.2
Placement:			
0 no answer	20.8	21.4	20.7
1 APE staff with others	6.5	7.1	6.4
2 Test results/Spec. Ed. rec.	2.0	0.0	2.3
3 Consult and monitor	1.7	3.6	1.5
4 Special or ARD committee	22.2	21.4	22.3
5 District criteria	3.4	7.1	3.0
6 Motor skills evaluation	7.8	7.1	7.9
7 Assessment results	5.8	0.0	6.4
8 Full inclusion	1.0	0.0	1.1
9 Others	28.7	32.1	28.3
Instructional Decisions:			
0 no answer	21.2	21.4	21.1
1 APE Staff	17.7	21.4	17.4
2 Curriculum	2.7	0.0	3.0
3 Team approach	15.4	14.3	15.4
4 IEP	9.9	10.7	9.8
5 Direct service provider	6.8	10.7	6.4
6 Classroom teacher	2.7	7.1	2.2
7 Facilities of school	.7	0.0	.7
8 Central office	1.7	0.0	1.9
9 Other	21.2	14.3	21.9
Assessment Decisions:			
0 no answer	19.8	17.9	20.0
1 APE Staff	17.1	17.9	17.0
2 District suggested test	3.4	14.3	2.2
3 Teacher & director of Spec. Ed.	3.1	0.0	3.4
4 Team (OT/PT/Teacher)	16.0	17.9	15.8

5 Regular classroom teacher	.7	3.6	.3
6 Referral process	1.7	0.0	1.9
7 Those licensed to evaluate	8.2	10.7	7.9
8 IEP	4.1	3.6	4.2
9 Other	25.9	14.3	27.2

Section 4: Training Perceptions

The goal of this section of the survey was to determine the content emphasis that was received and desired by the respondents during their formal training to be adapted physical educators. The teachers were first asked to consider their total course work as a 100% and to divide this amount across four broad categories. An example was given on the survey demonstrating a hypothetical distribution. In the second part of this section (Question 23), the teachers were asked to break down the percentages reported in Question 22 for the four broad content categories into a number sub-areas. The actual questions and results are presented below.

Indicate the percentage of time you received in the following training areas in your adapted physical education training. Then indicate the percentage you think should be given to these training areas. (Question 22 on the survey)

The purpose of this item was to force the teachers to divide the emphasis they had received in their formal training into four discrete categories. The results in Table 42 reveal that the teachers reported receiving approximately equal emphasis in the Scientific Foundations, Behavioral & Educational Foundations, and Planning & Implementation and significant less emphasis in Professional Development. When comparing the two groups, there were minor differences between the groups.

Table 42.
Mean content emphasis Received by major content area and group.

Training Emphasis RECEIVED

Training Area*	Total Mean	SD	FTE Mean	SD	Other Mean	SD
Scientific Found.	28.3	16.0	27.7	15.4	28.4	16.0
Behav. & Educ. Found.	26.6	15.2	28.1	10.5	26.4	15.7
Planning & Implem.	30.0	16.6	28.5	14.6	30.2	16.9
Professional Devel.	18.6	15.3	16.6	9.9	18.8	15.8

* The text describing the training areas was presented completely with no abbreviations in the actual survey.

The second part of this question asked the teachers to indicate the emphasis they would have desired in their formal training in each of the same four categories. Review of the results in Table 43 reveals that the greatest emphasis desired was in Planning & Implementation, followed by Scientific Foundations, Behavioral & Educational

Foundations, and Professional Development. When comparing the desired emphasis (Table 43) with the received emphasis (Table 42), the most notable difference was that the teachers would have preferred more emphasis on Planning and Implementation and slightly less on Behavioral & Educational Foundations and Scientific Foundations. Overall, there was little difference between the FTE and Other groups in terms of the emphasis received and desired in their formal training.

Table 43. Mean content emphasis Received by major content area and group.

Training Emphasis DESIRED

	Total		FTE		Other	
Training Area	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Scientific Found.	26.9	13.6	24.1	9.9	27.2	14.0
Behav. & Educ. Found.	22.4	13.1	21.6	8.4	22.5	13.6
Planning & Implem.	37.1	14.6	37.0	13.2	37.1	14.8
Professional Devel.	18.0	13.7	17.5	9.4	18.0	14.1

Below are the specific sub-areas that could be listed under the above training areas. Further break down the percentages you gave to the training areas and specify the emphasis that should have been given to the sub-area to meet your current job responsibilities. (Question 23 on the survey)

The goal of this question was to have the teachers beak down the percentage they assigned to each of the four major content categories across a number of sub-content areas. The results for this question are presented in Table 44.

Table 44.
Mean content emphasis desired by sub-content areas and group.

Training Emphasis DESIRED

	Total		FTE		Other		
Training Area	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p
Scientific Found.	28.3	14.2	24.9	10.1	28.7	14.5	
-Human development	7.4	4.8	6.7	3.4	7.5	4.9	
-Motor development	8.9	5.6	7.0	4.1	9.1	5.7	.07
-Exercise science	6.9	4.7	5.3	2.7	7.1	4.9	.06

-Research ...	6.5	5.1	5.9	4.5	6.6	5.2
Behav. & Educ. Found.	22.6	13.8	21.5	7.8	22.7	14.3
-Historical & Phil.	4.1	3.0	4.0	1.6	4.1	3.1
-Psychol-Social	5.8	5.5	5.4	3.1	5.8	5.7
-Unique attributes	7.1	4.9	7.2	3.3	7.0	5.0
-Curr. & Instr. Theory	7.1	5.5	6.0	5.5	7.2	5.5
Planning & Implement.	37.6	15.4	36.0	15.1	37.8	15.4
-Curriculum Develop	6.4	4.0	5.6	2.8	6.5	4.1
-Assessment	6.8	3.8	7.1	4.2	6.7	3.7
-Instruct. Planning	6.9	4.7	6.3	4.0	6.9	4.8
-Teaching	9.8	6.1	8.9	6.0	9.9	6.1
-Consult. & Staff Dev.	5.2	4.0	4.6	2.7	5.3	4.1
-Evaluation	5.4	3.7	6.5	5.5	5.3	3.4
Professional Develop.	18.0	14.7	16.3	8.0	18.2	15.3
-Continuing Education	7.7	10.0	5.3	3.9	8.0	10.4
-Ethics	4.9	4.3	4.3	2.3	5.0	4.5
-Communication	6.7	6.6	7.1	4.6	6.6	6.8

It should be noted that there are slight variations between the values reported in Table 43 for the desired emphasis for the four major content areas in Questions 22 and for the same areas in Table 44. These variations are due to a reduction in the number of cases used in Table 44. In order for teachers' data to be included in Table 44, their individual percentages for each sub-content area must have summed to the total percentage for that category. If the sub-content areas did not sum to the correct total, that subject's data were dropped from this analysis.

Review of the percentages reported in Table 44 reveal minor differences between the teachers in the FTE and Other groups. Most notably on the sub-content areas of motor development and exercise science, both of which approached significance and for which the Other group desired slightly more emphasis. On all the other content areas there appeared to be little differences when comparing the actual mean percents reported. Another way to view these data would be in terms of which sub-content areas teacher desired the greatest emphasis. Table 45 shows the top 10 sub-content areas ranked by magnitude of emphasis desired by the FTE and Other groups. Examining the data from this perspective reveals that while both groups ranked Teaching as the sub-content that should receive the greatest emphasis, the second through fourth priories were distinctly different for these two groups. The FTE group rated emphasis on unique attributes of learners, assessment and communication as their highest priorities compared to the Other group which ranked motor development, continuing education, and human development as their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

highest priorities. These data should be interpreted cautiously given that teachers' ratings of desired emphasis were probably biased to some degree by their current training and experience. The FTE group by definition, for example, had to have a Master's degree and four or more years teaching experience in adapted physical education.

Table 45.
Rank of sub-content areas by magnitude of emphasis desired by group

	Total		FTE		Other	
Sub-content Area	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
Teaching	9.8	1	8.9	1	9.9	1
Motor Devel.	8.9	2	7.0	5	9.1	2
Cont. Educ.	7.7	3	5.3	9	8.0	3
Human Devel.	7.4	4	6.7	6	7.5	4
Unique Attrib.	7.1	5	7.2	2	7.0	7
Curr & Instr.	7.1	6	6.0	8	7.2	5
Instr Planning	6.9	7	6.3	7	6.9	8
Ex. Science	6.9	8	5.3	10	7.1	6
Assessment	6.8	9	7.1	3	6.7	9
Communication	6.7	10	7.1	4	6.6	10

Finally, the teachers' percent allocations indicate that they felt that all of the sub-content areas were important. One possible outcome was that teachers could have assigned no emphasis to some areas in order to increase the emphasis assigned to other areas they felt were extremely important. Review of the raw data reveals that while a few teachers responded in this manner, the majority assigned some value to all of the sub-content areas. This is particularly informative when examining some of the less traditional areas under the Professional Development category which received emphasis ratings comparable to the Behavioral and Educational Foundation category. The survey by design did not allow teachers to add sub-content area. Had this option been available and used, group comparisons would not have been possible. It should be noted that during the pilot testing of the survey blanks had been used to collect additional areas. This added content was either meshed with an existing category (e.g., consulting and staff development) or added as a stand alone category in the final survey.

References

Bird, P.J., & Gansneder, B.M. (1979). Preparation of physical education teachers as required under PL 94-142. Exceptional Children, 45, 464-466.

Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kelly, L.E. (1997a). Certified Adapted Physical Educators 1997-1998 National Registry. Charlottesville, VA: NCPERID-APENS.

Kelly, L.E. (1997b). Adapted Physical Education National Standards: Study Guide. Charlottesville, VA: NCPERID-APENS.

Kelly, L.E. (Project Director, NCPERID). (1995). Adapted physical education national standards. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kelly, L.E. (1993). Adapted physical education national standards: A call for action. Palaestra, 10(1), 15-18.

Kelly, L. E. (1992). Adapted physical education national standards. (A Special Project funded by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Division of Personnel Preparation: #H029K20092.)

Kelly, L.E. (1991a). National standards for adapted physical education. Advocate, 20(1), 2-3.

Kelly, L.E. (1991b). [Developing outcome standards for adapted physical education]. Unpublished raw data. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Melograno, V.J., & Loovis, E.M. (1991). Status of physical education for handicapped students: A comparative analysis of teachers in 1980 and 1988. Adapted Physical Activity.

Appendix A

ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION NATIONAL STANDARDS

INFORMATION ORDER FORM

Please indicate below the information you desire and then send/fax this form to the Adapted Physical Education National Standards Office. Current information pertaining to the APENS Project can also be obtained on the World Wide Web at: http://teach.virginia.edu/go/apens/ To order a copy of the National Registry or a copy of the APENS: Study Guide include a check payable to APENS for the amount indicated below.

_____ APENS Exam Flier (free)

_____ APENS Certification Information Brochure (free)

_____ APENS Exam Application Packet (free)

_____ APENS Study Guide ($10 + $1 shipping and handling)

_____ APENS National Registry ($10 + $1 shipping and handling)

_____ NCPERID Membership Form (free)

The Adapted Physical Education National Standards manual can be ordered directly from Human Kinetics publishers by calling 1-800-747-4457.

Requested Information should be Mailed to:

Name: _____
Street Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____

Send or Fax this form to:

Adapted Physical Education National Standards
P.O. Box 6639
Charlottesville, VA 22906-6639
Fax: 1-888-APENS-EXAM

Appendix B

APENS Job Analysis Survey

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION PRACTITIONER'S SURVEY

Thank you for taking time to fill-out the practitioner's survey. Your input in the development of National Standards is invaluable. This survey asks you to describe the services you provide to students with disabilities. Some questions ask you about whether you teach Adapted Physical Education directly or indirectly. To alleviate any confusion you may have concerning what direct or indirect services means, the following definitions apply:

Direct Adapted Physical Education: Adapted Physical Education taught solely by you as the Adapted specialist in the school. You are the students' primary Physical Education teacher, and actually provide the instruction given.

Indirect Services: Indirect services could be labeled as itinerant or consultant. Indirect services implies that you provide information, assessment or other assistance, but do not teach the children directly. The actual Physical Education services are taught by another person.

1) What is the approximate total (regular and special education) student enrollment at the school(s) you teach?

School #1	_____	School #6	_____	School #11	_____
School #2	_____	School #7	_____	School #12	_____
School #3	_____	School #8	_____	School #13	_____
School #4	_____	School #9	_____	School #14	_____
School #5	_____	School #10	_____	School #15	_____

2) How many hours per week are you contracted to work? Hours per week: _____

- If you travel to schools, please indicate how many of these hours you spend traveling? _____
- Excluding travel time, how many hours per week do you teach Physical Education to students with disabilities (***Direct services***)? Hours per week: _____
- Excluding travel time, how many hours per week do you provide consultation and/or support services related to Adapted Physical Education, to students with disabilities (***Indirect services***)? Hours per week: _____
- Excluding travel time, how many hours per week of your work time do you spend outside of Adapted Physical Education? Hours per week _____

Briefly explain these **outside** responsibilities that you perform during the school week:

_____

_____

_____

Please continue on the back of this page

3) At which of the following school levels do you work? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- ☐ 0-2 years (infants)
- ☐ 3-5 years (preschool)
- ☐ 6-12 years (elementary)
- ☐ 13-15 years (middle/Jr.H)
- ☐ 16-21 years (high school)

4) How many students with disabilities do you provide ***direct*** Adapted Physical Education services.

Number of students: _____

5) How many students with disabilities do you provide ***indirect*** Adapted Physical Education services?

Number of students: _____

6) Considering their degree of motor delay, how many of the students that you provide **direct** Adapted Physical Education to would you place in the following categories?

1-2 years of delay _____
3-4 years of delay _____
5-6 years of delay _____
More than 6 years delay _____

Total (should match total reported in #4) _____

7) Considering their degree of motor delay, how many of the students that you provide **indirect** Adapted Physical Education to would you place in the following categories?

1-2 years of delay _____
3-4 years of delay _____
5-6 years of delay _____
More than 6 years delay _____

Total (should match total reported in #5) _____

Please continue on the next page

FOR QUESTIONS 8-9, PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS INDICATED IN QUESTIONS 4-5 INTO THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORIES.

8) Of the students for whom you provide **direct** Adapted Physical Education services, indicate the number that are in the following age groups? **(Total should match total in #4)**

0-2 years (infants)	___
2-5 years (preschool)	___
6-12 years (elementary)	___
13-15 years (middle/JrH)	___
16-21 years (HS)	___
Total	___

9) Of the students for whom you provide ***indirect*** Adapted Physical Education services, indicate the number that are in the following age groups? **(Total should match total in #5)**

0-2 years (infants)	___
2-5 years (preschool)	___
6-12 years (elementary)	___
13-15 years (middle/JrH)	___
16-21 years (HS)	___
Total	___

10) What Physical Education placements are available in your school? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- ☐ Combination of Regular and Adapted Physical Education
- ☐ Special Olympics/Sports for the Disabled in addition to Physical Education.
- ☐ Related services (Physical & Occupational Therapy)
- ☐ Regular Physical Education with support services in Adapted Physical Education.
- ☐ Special Olympics/ Disabled Sports in place of Physical Education.
- ☐ Regular Physical Education only
- ☐ Adapted Physical Education only
- ☐ Other, please specify _____

11) Are any of the following used in place of Physical Education in your school? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- ☐ Special Olympics/Disabled Sports in place of Physical Education.
- ☐ Supervised recess in place of Physical Education.
- ☐ Related services in place of Physical Educaton (Physical & Occupational Therapy)
- ☐ Other, please specify _____

Please continue on the back of this page

12) For the students you teach ***directly***, indicate the percentage for whom you are **usually** involved in each of the following processes. Please check the appropriate box for each decision.

Percentage of Students

	None	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%
Eligibility for services					
Placement decisions					
IEP Decisions					
Instructional Content					

13) For the students you teach ***indirectly***, indicate the percentage for whom you are **usually** involved in each of the following processes. Please check the appropriate box for each decision.

Percentage of Students

	None	Less than 25%	25-50%	51-75%	More than 75%
Eligibility for services					
Placement decisions					
IEP Decisions					
Instructional Content					

If you were not involved in the above processes, who makes these decisions, and why?

_____

_____

_____

Please continue on the next page

14) If you are **usually** involved in making placement decisions for students who receive Adapted Physical Education, which of the following do you **usually** use? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- ☐ I do not make these decisions
- ☐ Reports given at IEP meetings
- ☐ Informal comments from parents
- ☐ Informal comments from other teachers
- ☐ Weekly or monthly progress reports
- ☐ Criterion Referenced tests
- ☐ Norm-Referenced tests (Standardized)
- ☐ Professional judgment
- ☐ Comparing entrance & exit criteria
- ☐ Physical Education teachers' input
- ☐ Other, please list _____

15) What criteria do you **usually** use in deciding what Adapted Physical Education instructional content should be taught? (CHECK THOSE THAT APPLY TO YOUR SITUATION)

- ☐ Adapted Physical Education curriculum
- ☐ Regular Physical Education curriculum
- ☐ Professional judgment
- ☐ Checklist of pre-set activities
- ☐ The ability of the student
- ☐ Parents requests
- ☐ Student's projected recreational needs.
- ☐ Assessment data
- ☐ Classroom teacher suggestions
- ☐ Time available for instruction
- ☐ Facilities available
- ☐ Special Education label
- ☐ Student's past & current recreation needs
- ☐ Student's interest
- ☐ Other, please list _____

16) What issues have you been asked to explain to others in relation to the profession of Adapted Physical Education? (CHECK THOSE THAT APPLY)

- ☐ What is Adapted Physical Education?
- ☐ The difference between Adapted and Regular Physical Education
- ☐ The difference between Adapted Physical Education and related services (e.g., physical therapy)
- ☐ The role of the Adapted Physical Education teacher
- ☐ Identifying children who need Adapted Physical Education
- ☐ Other, please list _____

17) What other responsibilities, outside of your duties as an Adapted Physical Educator, do you have in your school? (CHECK THOSE THAT APPLY)

- ☐ After school programs
- ☐ Before school programs
- ☐ Fund raising
- ☐ Coaching Disabled Sports
- ☐ Other teaching responsibilities
- ☐ Curriculum committees
- ☐ Athletic Training
- ☐ CPR training
- ☐ Administrative duties
- ☐ Bus/lunch duties
- ☐ Other coaching responsibilities
- ☐ Other, please list _____

Please continue on the back of this page

Provision of Adapted Physical Education in Regular Physical Education

Questions 18-20 ask you about your role assisting students with disabilities in the Regular Physical Education setting. We are interested in how students with disabilities are being served in Regular Physical Education.

18) **When** do you **usually** perform assessments for your students with disabilities that you serve (directly or **indirectly**) in the Regular Physical Education setting? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

	For the students I teach..... DIRECTLY	INDIRECTLY
I'm not required to assess in this setting.	_____	_____
Only when requested	_____	_____
Prior to the student's entry into the Regular Physical Education	_____	_____
On-going assessment	_____	_____
Other, please describe _____		

19) How do you **usually** assess students with disabilities in the Regular Physical Education setting? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

	For the students I teach..... DIRECTLY	INDIRECTLY
I'm not required to assess in this setting.	_____	_____
Informal Assessments	_____	_____
Norm-Referenced Tests (Standardized)	_____	_____
Solicit input from others (classroom teacher, parents)	_____	_____
On-going assessment	_____	_____
Other, please describe _____		

20) How do you **usually** assist in transitioning special education students into Regular Physical Education and/or other settings? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

	For the students I teach..... DIRECTLY	INDIRECTLY
I am not involved in this process	_____	_____
I design individual transition (school to community) plans specific to Physical Education/recreational needs	_____	_____
I assist the Regular Physical Education teacher on a regular basis with the transition plan	_____	_____
I design lesson plans for students' Regular Physical Education teacher.	_____	_____
Other, please describe _____		

21) For what staff development issues or activities have you been asked to provide information? (CHECK THOSE THAT APPLY)

- ☐ Behavior management
- ☐ Adapted games and activities
- ☐ Adaptive equipment
- ☐ Adapted aquatics
- ☐ Special Olympics
- ☐ Disabilities
- ☐ Transition plans
- ☐ Disabled Sports
- ☐ Assessment for individuals with disabilities
- ☐ Early childhood education/intervention
- ☐ IEP
- ☐ Individual Family Service Plan
- ☐ Safety
- ☐ Legal mandate issues
- ☐ Integration
- ☐ Wheelchair basketball
- ☐ Motor development
- ☐ Wheelchair games
- ☐ Ways to accommodate students in Regular Physical Education
- ☐ Writing goals and objectives
- ☐ Inclusion
- ☐ Other, please list_____

EMPHASIS IN YOUR ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAM

- The next section of the survey asks you about your Adapted Physical Education training. First (question 22) you will be asked to indicate the emphasis given to four general areas in your Adapted Physical Education training, as well as the emphasis you think should have been given to these areas. Then consider your job requirements and the children with which you currently work. After considering your job requirements and the children you work with, indicate the percent emphasis you feel should be given to these areas in today's College and University Adapted Physical Education training programs (question 23). We realize this is a complicated task, however, this next section is a very critical part of the survey. Thank you for taking the time to complete the next section.

Please continue on the back of this page

22) Indicate the percentage of time you received in the following training areas in your Adapted Physical Education training (column 1). Then indicate the percentage you think **should** be given to these training areas (column 2).

Training areas	Emphasis in your training	Emphasis you now think it should be
	Col 1	Col 2
I) Scientific Foundations	_____	_____
II) Behavioral & Educational Foundations	_____	_____
III) Planning & Implementation	_____	_____
IV) Professional Development	_____	_____
	100%	100%

Next you are going to be asked to take the percentages given in col 2, question 22, and further break the percentages down according to the emphasis you <u>now</u> think there should be. For example, you might have said that 35% should be focused on Scientific Foundations. Therefore, you would now divide the 35% among the 4 sub-areas:

I) Scientific Foundations **Percentage in column 2 =** **<u>35%</u>**

•Human Development	5%
•Motor Behavior	10%
•Exercise Science	10%
•Research, measurement & evaluation	<u>10%</u>
	35%

23) Below are the specific sub-areas that could be listed under the above training areas. Further break down the percentages you gave to the training areas (column 2, question 22) and specify the emphasis that **should have** been given to the sub-areas to meet your current job responsibilities.

I) Scientific Foundations Percentage in column 2 =_____

- •Human Development _____%
- •Motor Behavior _____%
- •Exercise Science _____%
- •Research, measurement, & evaluation _____%

II) Behavioral & Educational Foundations

Percentage in column 2 =_____

- •Historical & Philosophical Development _____%
- •Psycho-social Dimensions _____%
- •Unique Attributes of Learners _____%
- •Curriculum and Instructional Theory _____%

III) Planning & Implementation

Percentage in column 2=_____

- •Curriculum Development _____%
- •Assessment _____%
- •Instructional Planning _____%
- •Teaching _____%
- •Consultation & Staff Development _____%
- •Evaluation _____%

IV) Professional Development Percentage in column 2=_____

- •Continuing Education _____%
- •Ethics _____%
- •Communication _____%

Please continue on the next page

24) Please describe how Adapted Physical Education is **usually** conducted in your school district. Include in this description information about eligibility, placement, instructional decisions and assessment.

Eligibility for Special Education services: _____

_____

Placement for Special Education services: _____

_____

Instructional Decisions for Special Education services: _____

_____

Assessment for Special Education services: _____

_____

25) If you could change how Adapted Physical Education is being conducted in your school district, what are the major aspects you would change?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please continue on the back of this page

26) Please indicate which degrees you have earned by placing a check in the appropriate space. In addition, please indicate your major area(s) of study during each degree.

	Degree	Year	Major Area	Minor Area
( )	Undergraduate	_____	_____	_____
( )	Master's	_____	_____	_____
( )	Doctorate	_____	_____	_____
( )	Other _____	_____	_____	_____

27) Position Title: _____

28) Length of time you have occupied this position: _____

29) Does your state have an approved credential and/or endorsement validation in Adapted Physical Education?

_____Yes _____No _____I don't know

30) If yes, do you have the state approved credential and/or endorsement/validation?

_____Yes _____No

31) In which setting do you teach?

_____Urban _____Non-Urban

PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS ON THIS SURVEY. PLEASE MAIL THE SURVEY IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY!!

DR. LUKE KELLY
DEPT. OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION
221 MEMORIAL GYMNASIUM
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22903

If you would like more information about the National Standards Project, and/or would like to work on one of the project's committees, please check below.

_____ Send me more information about the project.

_____ Send me information on how I can get more involved with the project.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE